THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World=Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editor: T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B. A.

VOL. 3.] THURSDAY MARCH 13, 1919. [No. 21.

The Hindu Message stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.

For *bona fide* students Rs 3 only.

Postage As. 13. Extra.

Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, *Srirangam.*

A Vision Of India.

ASVATTHA III.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

With gracious words the Lord in lay divine
Has said that 'midst the tall and green-robed trees
He shines in thy bright form of sunlit peace.
Thrice blessed art thou that thou shouldst be the shrine
And symbol of His wondrous grace benign,
Not e'en the Kalpaka which heaven's breeze
Doth fondle sweet His gracious heart doth please
As this most pure and perfect form of thine.
The morning sun doth gladly greet thy form;
The evening's splendours swoon with love of thee;
The full moon o'er thy head in glad repose
Her silver chariot stops with gentle charm
O'er thee the stars with quivering ecstacy
Reveal God's beauty with their purest glows.

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 13, MAR., 1919.

The Coercion Bills.

The attitude of the Government of India in proceeding with what have come to be known as the Rowlatt Bills in spite of the united opposition of all sections of public opinion throughout the country is certainly most deplorable. These measures are very undesirable and are most objectionable since they do away with open and judicial trial which is the birthright of every free citizen and place the people's liberty and freedom in the hands of individuals who are not under the control of any responsible popular Government. The passing of these Bills into Acts means the political extinction of India for many years to come. They would considerably set back the clock of progress. It is amazing to note that the Government of India have failed to realise to what extent these Bills have hurt the feelings of the nation and how very keenly their action is resented by the Public throughout the length and breadth of the country. These measures which are certainly direct attacks on the elementary political rights of the people have been introduced without the slightest justification at a time when the people were eagerly expecting the first liberal instalment of measures towards the realisation of Self-government. The reforms that are boomed with so much flourish of trumpets may after all turn out to be a mere will-o'the-wisp. But all the same they have been pointed out as inducements for getting the non-official Indian Members of the Imperial Council to agree to different proposals which the Government might in the meanwhile bring forward. Last year they were asked to agree to grants of money to the British Exchequer in aid of the war and now they are told that their conduct with regard to these obnoxious measures would weigh with the English Nation when the Reforms are considered. This is to say the least a silly argument. Knowing as we do the glorious tradition of freedom and liberty which forms the bed-rock of British Democracy we can confidently assert that the British people would surely consider any nation that consents to the passing of these Bills as unworthy of any political freedom and unfit to have any voice in the Government of their country. These Bills are, in the words of that noble patriot Mr. M. K. Gandhi, "unjust, subversive of the principles of liberty and justice and destructive of the elementary rights of individuals on which the safety of the community as a whole and the State itself is based." The concession which the Government has made at the eleventh hour namely that the Bills would operate for three years only is no concession at all. On the other hand it appears to be a bait thrown out to try and inveigle some of the non-official members of the Council to come over to the Government side. This is not the occasion to yield to such temptations. The question now is not so much of securing new rights as of preserving old ones which have been enjoyed so far. This situation forcibly reminds us of a Tamil saying and the story attached to it, both of which we heard

in our younger days. The saying reads as முன்செய்த தவத்தால் மூன்று மயிர் கொடுத்தேன் இன்னமும் கேட்பாயாகில் உள்ளதும் போய்விடும். A bald-headed person was very eager to get rid of his baldness and for that purpose made severe penance towards the God of gods. In course of time the Lord became pleased with his penance and directed one of his menial gods to go to him, ascertain what he wanted and grant the same to him. The minion assumed all importance, approached him and asked him what he wanted. The bald-headed person in his extreme eagerness cried thrice that he wanted hair to grow on his head. The little god in a mischievous mood told him that he had granted all his three requests and disappeared. The result was that only three hairs grew on his head. Sadly disappointed with it, the bald-headed person resolved to perform again severer penance and thereby invoke the God of gods. But the imp of the miniature god, getting apprehensive of his further appeal to the supreme God, appeared before him and repeated the above-quoted saying which means "I gave you three hairs as a result of your former penance. If you ask for more, take note that even what you now have will disappear." The bald-headed person of course went his way quietly, perfectly content to retain at least what he had got. Our present position now resembles that of the bald-headed person in the above story. It appears to be enough if we retain what we already possess. It is something like a case of fresh floods carrying away the existing water supply. No, we are mistaken, for it is not even a case of fresh floods. It is a case of anticipated freshes. This prospective fresh flood should not and could not be allowed to tamper with the existing springs of freedom. The little that we possess should not be permitted to be taken away because of the prospect of more to come at some uncertain future date. When we are eagerly extending both our hands to loyally and gratefully receive the ripe fruit of political emancipation our beneficient bureaucratic rulers place two black scorpions in our outstretched palms and state earnestly and magnanimously that if we patiently suffer the stings of these scorpions, our patience would be rewarded by their taking it into consideration when they think of granting the long and eagerly sought for ripe fruit of political emancipation in small slices as they deem fit. Is it seriously believed that this kind of argument would pass muster ? Those days are long gone by and as a direct result of a century and half of British Rule and liberal Education the people have begun to taste of the sweets of freedom and liberty and have learnt to estimate them at their real worth and hence have commenced to fight for them considering them as their birth-rights and consequently worth attainment at any cost. This is the cause of the origin of the Satyagraha vow promulgated by that true son of India, Mr. M. K. Gandhi, which runs as follows :—"Being conscientiously of opinion that the Bills known as the Indian Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill No. 1 of 1919 and the Criminal Law (Emergency Powers) Bill No. II of 1919 are unjust, subversive of the principles of liberty and justice and destructive of the elementary rights of individuals on which the safety of the community, as a whole, and the State itself is based, we solemnly affirm that, in the event of these Bills becoming

law and until they are withdrawn, we shall refuse civilly to obey these laws and such other laws as a committee to be hereafter appointed, may think fit, and we further affirm that in this struggle, we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property." This is an extremely serious step to take, but the ball has been set rolling and meetings are held every day all over the country to follow the lead thus given. Without questioning the wisdom or unwisdom of this vow and its practicability we shall take it as it is—as a 'settled fact' to use the words of Lord Morley—and request the Government not to misconstrue it but to attach due weight to it and thus withdraw the Bills in a most statesmanlike spirit. The vow has been and is being signed by several respectable people who have education enough to feel the responsibilities and realise the consequences of their actions and who have the capacity to lead thousands and hundreds of thousands of their fellow subjects along with them. Such being the case, it will not be wise or statesmanlike on the part of the Government of the day to ignore this movement or to brush it aside. It is equally the duty of every right-thinking Indian to help the Government to understand aright the extreme seriousness of the situation, to read fully the signs of the times, to realise the full significance of the writing on the wall and to exhibit in a gracious and magnanimous manner, wise statesmanship and sound common-sense for which the British are always noted. If the Government persists in its course without heeding the warning, the result may be what the authorities themselves in their wisdom did not bargain for. Meanwhile the danger that is threatening is real. The very fundamental rights of justice and freedom are about to be taken away. The axe is laid deep into the roots of the stately tree of justice and liberty and hence no Indian, be he moderate or extremist, conservative or progressivist, orthodox or social reformer, Hindu or Mahommedan, young or old, would be true to his country if he directly or indirectly helps in the passing of these measures into Law. In the words of the great leader Sir Dinshaw Petit "he would be false to his very blood and bones if he did so."

Notes and Comments.

We are sorry to note that the provisions of the Indian Press Act have been applied against the '*Desabhaktan*' a Tamil daily published in Madras under the editorship of Mr. T. V. Kalyanasundara Mudaliar. The deposit of Rs. 1,000 deposited as security on behalf of the Press in which the paper is printed has been forfeited on account of four alleged objectionable articles mentioned in the order. Three of these articles were written several months ago and but for this order would not have been even remembered. This is evidently the form chosen by the Madras Government to celebrate the second anniversary of the Press Deputation to the Viceroy. As the case is to be taken to the High Court we refrain from further comment on the unwisdom of the course pursued by the local Government.

*
* *

All is well that ends well. The public are glad that Principal Mr. Johnston has tendered an apology in Court for defiling the image of Sarasvati, though we expected the apology to have been made much earlier—prior to the institution of the legal proceedings. Better late than never seems to have been the motto of the Principal. Here are the terms of the apology.

1. That I admit that my conduct in putting the image of Sarasvati into

the dust-bin was an unjustifiable slight upon Hindus.

2. That I am sincerely sorry for my action, although I had no intention at the time of wounding any one's religious feeling.
3. That I apologise to the Hindu Public for having hurt their feelings and hope they will accept this expression of regret.

The Court rightly remarked to Mr. Johnston that "his action did not reflect any credit upon his intelligence." Certainly he acted more as a fanatic than as the responsible head of a College. We trust that the Principal came out of the Court a wiser man.

*
* *

To those who have Brahmins in the brain we commend the following extract from Sir J. D. Rees' article in the *Sunday Times*.

"It betrays an inadequate grasp of a large question to suggest that Brahmins are priests exercising spiritual influences over other castes; that there are working classes in India analogous to our industrial classes of the same designation; that 94 per cent. of a vast population can possibly receive communal representation in any conceivable system of government; that only the soldier understands the people; that the reformers are a small interested band of by no means disinterested office seekers; and that they have no support at all among the masses of the people. A Brahmin is no more a priest now than Mr. Mason is a house builder, Mr. Baker a breadmaker, or Mr. Taylor a fashioner of clothes. The Brahmins are an aristocracy of intellect no less than of birth, and if they are an oligarchy, they are at any rate, not an oligarchy of wealth. They have played a great part in governing India under all her masters, and for the obvious reason that they are the natural accepted leaders of the people. The Maharaja of Mysore, not a Brahmin prince, when approached by a deputation of non-Brahmins, said: "It is far from my desire that any community should be penalised on account of its caste, simply because it was the first to educate itself and utilise fully the opportunities for advancement offered to all my subjects alike." This is the simple truth.

*
* *

We read in the *Pioneer* the following news furnished by its Bombay correspondent.

"Our Parsee neighbours are discussing questions concerning their womanhood. They do not like marriages of Parsi girls with non-Parsi men. Such marriages have, according to Sir Jamestjee Jeejibhoy, the nominal head of the community, caused alarm; so they met to express the opinion that as a community they disapproved such marriages and to take steps to consider what practical measures should be adopted to prevent them. And the conclusion they arrived at was to ostracise Parsi girls marrying, say, a Mahomedan, as recently occurred. They also recommended parents and guardians not to give too much liberty to their girls, to endeavour to increase their faith in their own religion from childhood and to promote a feeling of pride for their community by setting them a good example.

What does this point to? We would strongly recommend this to the notice of the Hon. Mr. V. J. Patel who has introduced the Inter-caste Marriage Bill.

*
* *

The Hon'ble Sir Rajendranath Mukerjee, presiding at the distribution of prizes at the Government Commercial Institute, Calcutta, gave the students by way of advice a few practical hints to guide them against certain pitfalls that they are likely to come across. As they are so very valuable that they should always be kept in mind by those who wish to be successful in business, we give them below in full.

1. Do not hesitate to enter as an apprentice and to work under a man who may not possess such academical degrees as yourself.
2. During your apprenticeship period consider yourself as a student with a genuine desire to learn and to be useful, and strictly submit to the discipline of the office.
3. Do not be sensitive or resent admoni-

tions from your superiors when you make mistakes.

4. Be always punctual and try to look smart and neat.

5. Never divulge business secrets in conversations with your friends.

6. Avoid being too familiar with your juniors in your office and acquire the habit of enforcing discipline.

7. Be earnest and assiduous in your work and pay every attention to minute details.

8. Never contradict your seniors even if you think they are wrong in their instructions.

9. Do not annoy an employer by constantly demanding an increase of pay but wait for a suitable occasion and never ask for an increase of pay on the plea of poverty or the heavy burden of your family, for steady good work scarcely ever fails to attract your employer's attention.

10. Be always truthful, readily admit your mistakes, never try to shirk responsibility or blame others for your own mistakes. Be always respectful and never be impertinent. It is not difficult to express your grievances without being impertinent.

11. Do not absent yourself from your work on frivolous pretexts.

12. Avoid verbosity in your languages. Try to be short and to the point.

13. Be honest in your dealings and let the aim of your life be not to lose the confidence of your employer remembering that devotion to duty and loyalty to employer are always rewarded.

14. And lastly—Never mix business with politics.

Olla Podrida.

Dr. Carpenter said sometime ago that "political relation is no relation with humanity." Is that the reason why sometimes people are not humane or even human?

*
* *

Mr. D. Mitra said recently in a lecture at Madras that he learnt in England at the Oxford University in 8 weeks what he took two years to learn at Calcutta. Did he learn the same thing over again at Oxford? Some people want to show off their superiority in having gone to the West and make very sweeping statements which they want all of us to swallow. Exaggeration is in direct proportion to credulity.

*
* *

Mrs. F. G. Pearce has been organising girl scouts as Mr. F. G. Pearce has been organising boy scouts. Such absolute identity of interest and occupation is very affecting to behold. Everybody wants to organise and drill us. The wonder is that everyone of them succeeds, provided he or she comes from abroad.

*
* *

Meantime *our* people are busy advertising for brides. A young (Andhra) is advertising for a Brahmin bride. He is young fair, rich, and handsome. Does he blush at this enumeration of his good qualities? But all this is his own enumeration.

*
* *

Calcutta is jubilant over a new inter-caste marriage. Even the winning of the world-war pales into insignificance before this wondrous achievement. Hail! all-conquering Cupid!

*
* *

In the recent pollution case the Thiya accused was allowed to sit down but the Brahmin accused was ordered to stand. Mr. Manjeri Rama Iyer said that a Thiya being treated better than a Brahmana is a sign of the times. Some people speak very truly and very well sometimes. I wonder what it is a sign of? Is it a sign of most Brahmins or at least some Brahmins having become worse than what the Thiyas were before? Or is it a sign similar to the writing on the wall?

*
* *

But we have got at least piety left in India as a straggling virtue, is it not? What a piety it is? It has taken the form of doing puja to Mr. Gokhale's portrait at Madanapalle. I suppose that man has made himself God, God has made Himself scarce. Piety is now running in new channels. Indeed nowadays everything is running in new channels.

*
* *

Take for instance that fine illustration of Indian manhood running in new channels. It also took to running. A Panjabi Mahomedan entered a third class railway carriage. The latter being really a kennel, he behaved like a———. He could not find accommodation and drew his knife to create a vacancy. 10 or 12 men, women, and children were there. Two men, a woman, and a child jumped out of the carriage, and 2 or 3 men were stabbed by the hero.

* * *

Some of the Madras ladies met under the auspices of the Social Reform Association passed a momentous resolution in favour of Patel's Bill. Marriage is fusion; so every fusion is marriage that is what every one thinks nowadays. We have read of "ladies whose eyes rain influence and judge the prize." But in this case the ladies toiled below for the amelioration of humanity while Rao Bahadur O. Kandasami Chetti, Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai, and Mr. A. Madhaviah sat in the balcony and watched the wordy tournament for the welfare of the world Mrs. P. N. Raman Pillai presided. The very first words that fell from her lips were that those who attended were enlightened ladies and that the charge that women obstructed Hindu social reform was unfounded. She asserted that Patel's bill was in accordance with Hindu religion. Miss Chattopadhyaya moved a resolution supporting the bill. Resolutions, resolutions, resolutions everywhere and not a drop of common sense. Both the ladies spoke in English. The usual stars in the galaxy of Tamil lady-orators then shone out. Srimati Alamelumangamma, sister V. Balambal and Mrs. Rajammal buttressed up Patel's bill by Tamil speeches. Happy Patel! The Cynosure of all eyes in India!!!

* * *

In Ganjam a Vakil challenged certain Brahmins as unfit to be Jurors because the accused was a non-brahmana. He is however a Brahmin Vakil. Is there a provision of law for challenging Vakils and witnesses and judges, I wonder? I shall go and consult somebody.

SCRUTATOR.

The Bhagavad Gita.

With an English Exposition
By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.
(The substance of the lectures now being delivered at the Students' Sanatana Dharma Sabha Trichinopoly.)

ADHYAYA II.

(*continued.*)

आश्चर्यवत्पश्यति कश्चिदेन-
माश्चर्यवद्वदति तथैव चान्यः ।
आश्चर्यवच्चैनमन्यः शृणोति
श्रुत्वाप्येनं वेद न चैव कश्चित् ॥ २९ ॥

One regards the soul as marvel. Another speaks of the soul as a marvel. A third hears of him as a marvel. Even after hearing about him no one realises him.

NOTES:

1. This verse is meant to show the difficulty of realising the true nature of the soul. It suggests also that those who know and speak and hear about the Self are rare and remarkable men.

आश्चर्यो वक्ता कुशलोऽस्य लब्धा
आश्चर्यो ज्ञाता कुशलानुशिष्टः ।

2. To vision Him, to voice Him, and to hear about Him are all wonderful for He is beyond mind and speech.

3. The verse may mean also that He is realised, taught, and heard as a marvel.

4. Sri Ramanujacharya points out that the context shows that the Lord is referring here to the soul (jiva) and not to God. The soul is different from all material objects and is hence a real marvel, because a marvel is what is unlike all other things.

5. Nilakanta takes एनं to relate to the cosmos and says that the verse impresses upon us the inscrutable character of the world of being.

6. The soul can be realised in *yoga*. It is योगजप्रत्यक्ष. It is called wonderful because the realisations of the transcendental and supernormal consciousness appear so to the ordinary consciousness. The Katha Upanishad says:

परांचि खानि व्यतृणत्स्वयंभूः
तस्मात्परान्पश्यति नान्तरात्मन् ।
कश्चिद्धीरः प्रत्यागात्मानमैक्ष-
दावृत्तचक्षुरमृतत्वमिच्छन् ॥ ३१ ॥

7. We realise the supreme in deep sleep, yet we do not know it. Many speak learnedly about Him and many hear about Him. Yet very few know and *realise* Him. Only those whose mind becomes pure and free from sin can realise Him. As Sri Ramanujacharya finely says: महता तपसा क्षीणपाप उपचितपुण्यः कश्चित्पश्यति । It is said also: ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते पुंसां क्षयात्पापस्य कर्मणः.

8. Thus the view that this verse describes the oversoul and the view that it describes the cosmos have elements of truth; but the most appropriate wearing in the light of the context is that it describes the soul as it is, beyond and behind the body, the senses, and the mind. The soul is separate from the स्थूल, सूक्ष्म, and कारण bodies.

देही नित्यमवध्योऽयं देहे सर्वस्य भारत ।
तस्मात्सर्वाणि भूतानि न त्वं शोचितुमर्हसि ॥ ३० ॥

The soul though dwelling in the bodies of all is invulnerable and immortal. Therefore thou shouldst not grieve for any embodied being.

NOTES:

1. The Lord here returns to His own point of view and concludes the present प्रकरण (theme).

2. Death is not annihilation; it is no loss of ultimate and essential reality; it does not affect the real destiny of the soul. Where, then, is there any occasion for grief?

3. As regards this verse also, some take it as referring to God and others as referring to the soul. As stated by me already the context shows that it refers to the soul though the Lord could certainly have implied also the real and essential, divinity of the soul. The Adwaitins hold the soul and the oversoul to be one. The Visishtaadwaitins hold them to be separate and yet is one, because the Lord has the cosmos and the jivas as his universal body. According to them the souls are atomic and similar though the bodies differ from *devahood* downwards. The Dwaitins hold also that the souls differ in quality and capacity. Whether the ultimate truth is universal unity or universal equality or universal variety, all are agreed that the soul is *sachchidananda in* its essential nature. (*To be continued.*)

Random Jottings.

[BY SON OF INDIA.]

If a quantitative analysis of Non-official work at the recent meeting of the Madras Legislative Council will serve any purpose, here is one. With regard to the draft financial statement, as many as 57 resolutions were moved, of which 39 were "by leave withdrawn," 16 were put to the vote and rejected, and the remaining two were carried, their lives having been taken out of them. 12 amendments were brought forward 11 of them being defeated and the remaining one—unfortunately (or fortunately?) trivial—carried. The City Municipal Bill was assailed by no less than 58 amendments, but with the unflinching patronage of the Government irrevocably given, aided oft by the European section of the elected members and the indeterminate few from the Non-official Indian Camp the Bill maintained its ground with astonishing coolness, and finally emerged triumphant.

* * *

But even this episode has its silver lining. The Hon. the Most Reverend Archbishop Aelen who has never sinned into voting in company with the Non-official Indian members not only seconded Mr. Krishna Rao's resolution asking for an allotment of fifty thousand rupees for the establishment of Free Boarding Homes in select places for the benefit of the scholars of the depressed classes, but made bold to move an amendment in respect of the City Municipal Bill.

* * *

What has been gained in Archbishop Aelen has been more than lost in Mr. Ramanujachariar, who seems to have taken a leap backward. This whilom "hero of hundred fights", the stout passive resister who desired

to depose Sastri and Sarma who had grown out-of-date, chose the neutral attitude on at least three occasions. This ex-chairman of an important Moffussal Municipality opposed the amendment of Mr. Krishna Rao requiring the Government to consult the local bodies concerned and consider their objections before a notification is issued bringing the Agriculturist's Pest Act into force; and to crown all he achieved the much coveted distinction of being the single solitary non-official Indian member who voted with the Government against Mr. Rangachari's amendment fixing the maximum of House-Tax. Does this indicate anything?

* * *

So Sir Gordon Fraser and Mr. Crusha have resigned their seats on the Corporation as a protest against a certain provision in the new City Municipal Act requiring that contractors to the Corporation should not become commissioners on the Corporation. But the Hon. Non-official Indian members of the Imperial Legislative Council were loath to wound the susceptibilities of the Viceroy on no less a matter than the Rowlatt Bills. Just look on this picture and on that.

* * *

If I were a poet I would invoke "O for an hour of Gokhale or well-skilled Mehta to rule the fight!"

Dharma—XVII.

(By K. G. Natesa Sastri, Vaidya Visarad.)

Before proceeding further let us turn our attention to the application of the principles of Interpretation we have learnt till now to one or two questions of practical utility that seem to affect dangerously our social structure. We can have no legitimate ground for grievance when the Hon'ble Mr. V. J. Patel introduced his famous Bill in the Imperial Legislative Council to remove certain what to him seems "serious hardships in individual cases." He is perfectly at liberty to remove things which are hard to him and anybody who obstructs his so doing will only obstruct his legitimate exercise of his individual liberty, an important factor in these democratic days. It will be a nice thing worth enjoying if another member of the Council moves for leave to introduce a Bill to invalidate the Hon'ble Mr. Patel's Bill on the ground that his community feels serious hardships and hence even according to Patel's logic "even if one province or one caste is affected, the law should not remain as it is." Then there will be no end to curious, silly, and nonsensical Bills cutting one another's throat. What we are now concerned with is the adaucity with which the history of this holy land and its sacred laws are forced to yield precedents to support this insane marriage Bill. The leading Madras papers —take the "Hindu" and the "New India" contain no detailed information of the proceedings of the Simla session of the Council held in September last, but fortunately the October number of the "Modern Review" gives a little piece of information as to what took place in connection with this Bill. Sir George Lowndes, the Law member proceeded to observe as follows:—"............So far as marriages between a Hindu man of one caste, and a Hindu woman of a lower caste are concerned, they were allowed by the *sastras* in India during the whole of the best period of the Hindu history. They were not only legal but were recognised as such by every great writer on the subject."

Mr. Malavya—'That is not correct.'

Sir George Lowndes:—"I believe it is quite correct."

Mr. Malavya—'For 3000 years it has not been so.'

Sir G. Lowndes.—"My honourable friend is very brave and my Hon'ble friend Mr. Ayyangar was braver still, though I fancy with a very slight knowledge of the subject. He ventured to quote Manu as laying down that such marriages were improper. Now Manu, as my Hon'ble friend ought to know is probably a conglomeration of texts belonging to a great number of different periods. I can point out to my Hon'ble friend Mr. Ayyangar and to the Hon'ble Pandit passages in Manu which directly recognise the legality of such marriages and the succession of property under them. It is not certain to what period the latter texts belong, but they are clearly not of the same period as the others. Manu, it is true, contains one or two texts, to which the Hon'ble Mr. Ayyangar referred, disapproving of such marriages; but Manu is hardly an authority, as the work contains texts both ways etc..." Surely the mind of the true Hindu cannot but recoil with horror at the scant courtesy and reverence shown to Manu. Many other

illogical utterances were made by the Law member, but sufficient has been given above to illustrate his pitiable ignorance of the laws of interpretation, essential to a lawyer, and of his knowledge of Indian history. The gentleman who edits the "Modern Review" says "It is rather humiliating to find a distinguished Hindu leader like Pandit Madan Mohan Malavya subjected to correction on points of ancient Hindu history, law and custom by one who is neither an Indian nor a Hindu." It will be seen later on that it is not the case of the Hon'ble Pandit which is "rather humiliating" but it is that of Ramananda Chatterjee that is so. Whether the Hon'ble Pandit replied to those rash utterances of the Hon'ble Law member or not we have no means of knowing as nothing is reported in the "Modern Review" even. But admitting that such corrections by foreigners are humiliating we cannot help it for the simple reason that in these days of *individualism* men who happen to belong to the ruling race do not consider it essential to put restrictions upon themselves when they speak on the history and customs of a subjected race. Moral Law requires that one should not speak on the customs etc., of another if he cannot understand them, but yet the days are such that this law can make no impression upon him if he finds that it can be conveniently violated with impunity and a subject nation must submit to these hardships, and hence there is nothing improper if the Hon'ble Pandit had been, in the words of the Editor of the "Modern Review," corrected by the Hon'ble Law member.

Sir George Lowndes declares, if what is reported in the "Modern Review" is correct, that 'Manu is hardly an authority,' and from this it is clear that he forgets that he himself is hardly any authority, when he says anything concerning Manu, for firstly he is neither a Hindu nor an Indian, and secondly he has not initiated himself into the application of the rules of Interpretation without which a lawyer can have no legitimate claim to call himself as such. How works containing "texts both ways" can cease to become authorities, the Hon'ble Law member has not explained. On the other hand the rules of Interpretation as obtaining in his own country demand, as explained by Sir Peter Benson Maxwell, in his "Interpretation of Statutes," that for practical purposes all the Acts must be treated as one homogeneous whole and interpreted accordingly. This we remember to have read in the 4th Edition by Theobald of that work mentioned above, but we do not now see this passage in its 5th edition by F. Stroud, but at the same time the purport of this rule is contained in another passage in the said work which we shall show later on. We have already seen that the *validity* of any *pramana* rests not upon any extraneous thing, but on its intrinsic "ability to impart knowledge" or बोधकत्व; and as Manu has *bodhakatva* in it it can never cease to be an authority. The duty of a historian or a jurist is not to throw away anything which does not coincide with his views, but his aim must be to try whether anything can be learnt from it, for the circumstances under which it was shaped or to put it in legal terms the history of the enactment of Manu is not now before us nor can it be constructed afresh now unless we adopt the illogical method of starting from the wrong end as is done by the present-day writers of Indian history. Moreover rightly or wrongly Manu has come to be considered as a high authority on Hindu Law both by the Hindus as well as by the highest tribunals in the land, and it is now too late, on the part of the Hon'ble Law member, to question its authority. He is quite welcome to rest his case on purely social or economic or political grounds and try to break the dam that now protects the genuine Aryan community by permitting a hole in the shape of this permissive measure; but once having begun to deliver a lecture on the successive stages of the history and law of this land he cannot consistantly declare that the ancient "Manu is hardly an authority" because it contains "texts both ways." That only shows plainly that he is not competent to understand how statutes of a conflicting nature are to be interpreted, and understood correctly.

We shall continue this next time.

THE HINDU MESSAGE will be posted regularly every week to any address in India, Burma and Ceylon on payment of Rs. 6 only per annum; For all foreign countries within the Postal Union it will be despatched on payment of 10s. 6d. per annum. All subscriptions are payable in advance and should be remitted to the Manager "*The Hindu Message*", Srirangam.

The New Savitri.

(BY VASISHTHA)

In the town of Vasantapura there lived a Brahmin by name Chandrasekhara Sarma. Vasantapura is situated in the Tanjore District but neither the map nor the gazetteer will show it. Chandrasekhara Sarma was employed in one of the various departments of public service which silently effect exchanges of functional mediocrity and social obscurity for the joy and fulness of life. His son Satyavan was studying in one of our well-known public schools where eyes are blinded, minds are twisted, and hearts are coarsened. He had reached the dizzy heights of collegiate education and was now nearing the Mount Everest of graduation. Hence the matrimonial market rang with his praises from side to side. The marriage brokers were looking at him with hungry eyes and the fathers of marriageable girls were dreaming of him day and night. He was however wavering between greed and principle, because he was afraid of the sharp swords of his friends' tongues. He was a loud voiced social reformer and was afraid that he would be torn to pieces by his companions if he was found to encourage the marriage brokers or the fathers who had marriageable girls and who wanted to pour their treasures at his feet to show due honour to his greatness. His father on the other hand had no qualms of conscience, and there was no public opinion which was his solace or his guide or his critic. He had resolved to sell his son in the dearest market.

Near their house was the house of Narayana Sastri, a simple good man who had a few paternal acres and a pious God-fearing heart. His daughter Savitri shone in his household like a golden lotus flower and made him full of the truest happiness by reason of her beauty and her sweet innocence. She was educated by him in her mother tongue and in Sanscrit, and her harmonious nature revelled in and mastered the complex intricacies of Indian music which many masculine singers wrestle with unsuccessfully all their lives. She was proficient in household ways and was fitted in every way to be the light and bliss of a Hindu home.

When Savitri was young and Satyavan had not as yet soared into the empyrean of university study, her father used to say to Chandrasekhara Sarma that God designed the young boy and girl for each other. Chandrasekhara Sarma whom long years of official slavery had robbed of individuality used to feebly agree in this view, though in his heart of hearts he was building a great matrimonial future for his son with possible results of official betterment for himself. Savitri living in such an atmosphere and attached to the playmate of her childhood who was at one time a bright boy and not a half-blind dandy had chosen him as her lord as her namesake of old did in the good old days.

But when Satyavan developed a tail in the shape of the two magic letters B A., unforeseen changes occurred. A fat landlord worth millions set half a dozen brokers at him to hook him for his girl. The brothers came and besieged him and his father with offers of twenty thousand rupees and thirty thousand rupees. Chandrasekhara Sarma who had never seen sums above two digits was staggered by these proposals and felt bewildered by the necessity of choice between sums each of which took his breath away by its magnitude and magnificence.

Dharmaraja Iyer was one of these brokers. He had a special interview with Chandrasekhara Sarma.

"Why do you hesitate? I shall have your fortune made."

"I shall be glad to do as you suggest because you have always been my friend and not because I care for money, you know that."

"Do I not know it? You have never had any money and you have never cared for it. This sum of Rs. Thirty thousand will enable your son to become a first-rate lawyer and eventually a High Court Judge."

Chandrasekhara Sarma made a pretence of being indifferent to money and eventually agreed. Satyavan was torn between greed and fear, and the broker found it difficult to bend or break the young man's spirit. But he sought to captivate his soul by showing how he could beat all his schoolmates in the race of life if he began with such a start.

"I quite respect your scruples. But the best way for you to render conspicuous national service will be to accept this sum. It is freely offered to you. You

are not compelling any one to pay it. Why should you then hesitate?"

"Yes. I half agree. But my friends will ridicule and abuse me."

"Friends indeed! Their ridicule and abuse would be due to mere envy. If you succeed in life they will be at your feet."

Satyavan's few struggling elements of loyalty to virtue succumbed to this strategy.

The marriage day was fixed and the forthcoming wedding was the talk of the whole country. The soul of Satyavan's soul—his integrity of loyalty to high principles—was thus borne away by the broker. Savitri heard of this misfortune and felt bitterly the social wickedness which made such things possible. Satyavan's better nature had whispered to him now and then that he did ill in deserting Savitri. But the stern voice of the broker had lured his soul away and the higher nature within him slowly died of contemptuous neglect. Savitri had no mortal help, because in a society which is full of greed and low ideals and which auctions human beings in matrimonial markets while the Law looks on and applauds, no one cared for broken pledges or for broken hearts. She bowed before the image of Sri Rama in the household shrine and spent one whole night in meditation after the world had gone to sleep. A light broke upon her and made her heart bright with its presence. She resolved to ask her father to have the *Ramayana* read and expounded in her house.

Her request was granted and the reading of the *Ramayana* began. A great pundit and musician showered the blessed words in a golden rain of melody and brought the blessedness of grace into the arid parched up worldly hearts. Then came the day of Sita's marriage. Narayana Iyer invited Chandrasekhara Sarma, Satyavan, and Dharmaraja Iyer also for it. He had invited them also for dinner. It was in his house that day that Satyavan saw the sweet and simple and heavenly purity and innocence of Savitri. Her face, fair like the lotus flower, shone with the inner light of steady loyalty to high ideals. Her modesty was as deep as her learning and both were as deep as her piety and devotion. Satyavan felt a strange exaltation of nature in her presence and realised the petty meanness of the life of low ideals in which he and others of his time lived and moved. He felt as if he came out into a moral heaven from a moral hell. That night the Sita Kalyanam was expounded. That was the pleading of Savitri with the Angel of Death in human forms who had sought to deprive her of her life's sweetness. The hardened heart of Dharmaraja Iyer, the worldly heart of Chandrasekhara Sarma, and the wavering heart of Satyavan were moved profoundly by the holy narrative. Savitri's pleading was especially to Dharmaraja Iyer through the words of the immortal poet. It was he that had stolen and taken away the soul of Satyavan's soul. The sweet music of the verses and the sweeter music of the lives of the holy ones quelled and subdued the discords of his nature. His mind, purified by the hearing of the story, came from the Sita of the poem to the Savitri of real life. He found Satyavan sitting in a corner in tears. He said to him:

"I somehow feel to-night that I have done wrong in parting Savitri from you."

"Sir, I have done ill. Restore me to my better nature."

Chandrasekhara Sarma also felt that not all the wealth of the world can remove the poverty of the soul. That night all of them resolved to lead better lives and realised that to live in love of man and fear of God is far better than the wealth and power in the world. Dharmaraja Iyer gave up his life as a marriage broker and released Satyavan's better nature from the thraldom of licensed ill-doing. Chandrasekhara Sarma gladly accepted Savitri's hand for Satyavan. Savitri and Satyavan were married and lived happily like Sita and Rama.

The Dreams of the Soul.

(BY A DREAMER.)

III

Do I love Thee because Thou showerest riches on the world—the treasure of wealth and the treasure of power to enable us to shine forth in the panoply of earthly affluence and might?

Do I love Thee because I fear Thy wrath that may smite me to the dust with the darts of Thy displeasure?

Do I love Thee because I wish from Thee the gift of fame which will render my name

a light and a glory for all time?

Do I love Thee because I ask from Thee the gift of knowledge which will dower me with the treasury of thought and enable me to reign supreme in the realm of ideas?

No. I love Thee for Thyself so that I may live for ever in the light of Thy sweetness and hear for ever the melodies of Thy heavenly flute and sing for ever the perfections of Thy love.

IV

I ask Thee not to dower me with immortal raptures amidst the glows and glories of the highest heaven.

I ask Thee not for the pomp and pride of earthly rule amidst the adorations of courtiers and servants.

I ask Thee not for the extended mental vision which will look before and after and see deep into things and before which the entire map of Time will be unrolled.

I ask Thee not for beauty of person or dignity and grace of look or brilliance of ornamentation or splendour of attire.

I ask Thee not to reveal to me the secrets of life and death.

I ask Thee not to reveal to me why Thou speakest only in the silence of meditation and shinest only in the darkness of the heart's small chamber.

I ask only for the dower of love so that my love for Thee may realise the depth of Thy love for me.

Gleanings.

Democracy versus bureaucracy.

(By SHYAM BEHARI LAL.)

(continued)

Now according to the different answers to the question, who shall control the government, the different forms of government, *e. g.* monarchy, aristocracy, plutocracy, theocracy, democracy and in fact many other cracies depend. Therefore it would not be amiss to find out with whom tne ultimate soverign authority rests from which the government derives its sanction.

Plato in his "Republic" gives expression to the ideals of democracy which differs much from its modern form. He and his great disciple Aristotle did not abstract man from the society, the latter went to the length even of opening his Ethics by offering the economic structure of Society. Their ideal was to establish a large measure of justice between man and man and in their systems there seems to be no place for any form of government but in which the rights and privileges of the various members of the state are equal.

Now passing on to the modern times we find in the seventeenth century Thomas Hobbes rejecting Aristotle's notion of sociality as an essentially human characteristic and maintaining what is called the "Natural State of man." To come out of this chaos he invented the doctrime of Social contract by which the whole community surrender their right of individual sovereignty into the hands of one man who thenceforth becomes the absolute ruler of the State and whose authority nobody can deny in future. "But the logic of Hobbes' absolutism" says Mr. Benn, "shrivelled up under the Sun of English liberty"

Although after Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau maintained his views as to the origin of the political society which is false as is shown by recent writers who hold that in the primitive stages of human development governments like languages are not made but evolve, yet they hold in contradistinction to Hobbes' view that the will of the people should be the law. According to Locke, the chief and main end for which men unite into commonwealths is the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties and estates (Treatise of Government) and if a government neglects to secure this end, or invades the rights of its subjects it may be lawfully set aside whenever an opportunity occurs. Hence the people themselves are to be regarded as the sovereign authority.

It was according to this great democratic principle that the members of the French National Assembly formulated the rights of man and since then this principle has been adopted in all the States of Europe, Turkey excepted. As to Russia nothing can be said at present when it is being ruined by an internecine war and Bolshevik Terrorism prevails everywhere in the country.

Not only this, the democratic principle has created a tendency to extend the franchise to all adult males so that they may be able to force the government to do according to their own wishes. In England, even women have been enfranchised and authorised to sit in the House of Commons. Moreover,

the Bombay Legislative Council has also now passed the bill giving right to women to be elected as members of Bombay Municipal Corporation.

Besides this, written constitutions exist in all European countries, except England and Turkey, the one requiring none, so strong being the traditions of constitutional government granting none, to prevent kings or president or government officials to excercise despotic powers.

The upshot of this whole is that it is now acknowledged that it is the people at large in whom the sovereign power resides and who are the ultimate arbiters of their fate. Now we find that bureaucracy derives its authority from above, democracy from below *i. e.*, the people themselves. Even in religion where the authority might be supposed to come from above, the Reformation has denounced it and we find among the Protestants as far as my knowledge goes that the authority resides in the congregation and not in the clergy. In the latter it is only a delegated authority. If it be so, if man can look well after his soul can he not look after his poor body? I think the bureaucratic principle here falls to the ground.

Now as to the second point—whether the government is to be carried on by the people directly or through their representatives. This is the basis of the distinction between what is called Absolute or direct Democracy and Representative or indirect Democracy. This is the distinction between the ancient greek City States, for example, and the modern democracies. Neverthless, it is often advanced as an objection against modern democracy itself.

I say they confound the two ideas. To have a correct understanding of Absolute democracy, we must think of a small community, living within the four walls of a single town enjoying independent sovereignty as Athens was in the fifth century B. C. Or as the modern original Swiss Cantons are where all public business is discussed in a full assembly of the people. It was possible in ancient *City States*, and it is possible now in Switzerland because of the difficulty of communication between one part of the country and another and owing to the fact that geographical conditions isolated the Cantons which have remained independent.

Nowadays our idea of State has expanded from a City State to a big country under one government. Moreover, modern conditions do not permit of such City States. Therefore, the only form of democracy that is possible nowadays is what is called Representative Government.

Some sapient bureaucrats think that this is to give up the whole position. I say, not in the least. Whatever be the constitution, the representative body is responsible to the sovereign body whose creature it is. Whatever powers the latter may delegate to the former as long as the former is responsible to the latter, the principle of democracy still holds good. It is no secret nowadays that the control of the purse implies the control of policy and the lower or the representative chamber alone grants or withholds supply. The saying 'No taxation without represntation' is familiar to all of us. Thus the principle of democracy is not violated.

Moreover, some pious bureaucrats raise the objection that in representative government the will of the people is liable to be thwarted by their very agents. May it not be replied that it is rather an advantage that the first impulse of the public will, sometimes passionate and short sighted, should be tempered and enlightened by passing through a series of media on its way to action and the hold which the constituencies have upon their elections and in other ways is a sufficient guard against any defeat of a steady, earnest and public conviction.

Again it is objected that in a Representative Government majority is to decide and majority may often be in the wrong. Had not Socrates to drink the bitter cup of poison in accordance with the sentence of the majority? Yes, it was so with Socrates, and one must open and read Plato's dialogue with Crito to know that Socrates himself clung to the Athenian constitution and preferred dying in Athens rather than seeking the protection of some other government. Moreover is it not sufficient to point out that large minorities by opposition and criticism can get the point cleared and thus

---

The Title Page and Contents of the 2nd Vol. of the Hindu Message are now ready and copies will be sent free to such of the subscribers as require them along with the next issue.

hold in check the extremists on the other side? Moreover, if, as it is said, good government is no substitute for self-government be true, it implies the right to go wrong.

Even John Stuart Mill, who considers Representative Government to be the ideally perfect form of government and whose extension he thinks is inevitable, doubts, the sufficient mental qualities of the governing class under the system as compared with the aristocracy who have made it their business of life. But sufficient mentality can be secured by attaching the conditions of some educational qualifications in the persons appointed to public offices. Moreover, under a Representative Government there would be fair competition and only the best intellects would be able to come to the fore. Does anybody doubt the sagacity of the present British Cabinet because it is largely drawn from the people and not the aristocracy?

Another author who is now the democrat of democrats wrote more than a dozen years ago when she had not entered the arena of politics that democracy runs counter to all the compelling laws of nature, for said she, men are not born equal but very unequal and never can a stable society be built if we start by disregarding nature and treat all as having rights to equal power, the ignorant and the wise, the intellectual and the stupid, the criminal and the saintly. I admit that men are not bern equal but very unequal and *it is for this reason* that the wise, the intellectual and the saintly will, play the prominent part, by having the government of the people entrusted to them. Birth does not give man his rights. That is an exploded theory now. Whatever they are, they are made by the society and thus they can have no right as against society or its members. What are required are not equal rights for all, but equal chances and opportunities of developing and perfecting their personalities for all.

The bureaucrat might say that though a democracy is good during peace time, a centralised government is the only government for war purposes. To some extent this is true. But can democratic governments not rise to the occasion and succeed in gaining a unity and secrecy of purpose for outwitting the enemy without impairing their essential nature? It is democracy that has been the saviour of the world.

Modern Review.

(*To be continued.*)

HINDU MESSAGE

VOLS. I & II.

OCTR. 1917—APRIL 1918 & APRIL—OCTR. 1918

Bound in Cloth Price Each Rs. 3 only.

The Week.

While the precise dates cannot yet be announced, owing to the uncertainties of steamer sailings, Lord and Lady Willingdon and their staff, who are coming to Madras by sea *via* Colombo by the B. I. steamer *Mandala*, will probably arrive at Madras between 9th and 12th of April.

*
* *

According to present arrangements, Their Excellencies Lord and Lady Pentland and their party will leave Madras by sea *via* Colombo for England on the 29th March or later by the B. I. steamer *Chindwara*.

*
* *

The Government of Madras have sanctioned the distribution of a further subsidy of Rs. 2,99,838 among certain District Boards and Municipal Councils towards the construction of elementary school buildings.

*
* *

It is understood the Government of Mysore have under consideration the introduction of Mysore Currency notes within the state. The Government of Mysore is also said to be considering the levying of an income tax within the state and legislation will probably be introduced in the Legislative Council during the next month.

*
* *

It is with sincere feelings of grief that we have to record the premature and melancholy death of Mr. T. A. Gopinatha Rao M.A., Superintendent of Archæology in Travancore. He was a native of Srirangam and had a distinguished College career. He was a good Sanskrit scholar, had mastered photography,

drawing and other allied arts and was an enthusiastic worker in the field of Indian archaeology, in which he had made several original researches. His work the "Hindu Iconography" is a mine of information and shows clearly how deeply attached he was to his work. His death is a distinct loss to the country.

*
* *

The National High School at Trichinopoly will be raised into a Second Grade College in June next. The Senate of the University of Madras sanctioned its affiliation on Friday last and the Intermediate classes will be opened in June and the College will be fully equipped for Group III of the Intermediate course Mr. K. Ramanujachariar, B.A., who recently retired from the Pachaiyappa's College, has been appointed Principal of the new College, while Mr. V. Saranatha Aiyangar, M.A. and Mr. S. V. Viswanatham M.A., have been appointed as Lecturers in English and in History respectively.

Wit and Wisdom.

First Boy—Did you really win three prizes at school?

Second Boy—Yes, and one was for excellence of memory.

First Boy—How did you win the others?

Second Boy—The others? I forget what they were for.

*
* *

'Mamma, Am I to have a new doll?'

'Your old doll is quite good, my child.'

'But I too am quite good, and yet you have a new baby.'

*
* *

You want to make us believe that you were born at four o' clock in the morning. Bosh! You never got up before nine.

*
* *

Tompkinson (to his publisher)—'Why does your new catologue enter my novel under medical works?'

'Because it has been considered an excellent remedy for insomnia.'

*
* *

Doctor—You must be very careful. With her throat trouble your wife will not be able to speak above a whisper for two or three weeks.

Husband—Oh, doctor, is there any possibility of her desease becoming chronic.

*
* *

Wife—(vehemently) Yes. it was I who brought all the money into this household. What did you have before I married you?

Husband—(calmly) Peace.

*
* *

Secretary—Under what head shall I put down the cost of the operation performed on the Baroness?

Baron—General repairs.

*
* *

Little boy—'Are not all the words used to be found in the dictionary, Papa?'

Father—'No, my child, new words are coined every day.'

'And what is the last word, papa?'

'I don't know, dear. Ask your mother, she always has the last word.'

*
* *

The Astronomer—An automobile would take five hundred years to reach that star.

Merchant—And how much petrol?

*
* *

Secretary—Sir, how shall I end the letter? With "very respectfully" or "respectfully"?

Business Man—With "respectfully" of course. You know how I despise the fellow?

*
* *

First small boy—Do fishes grow quickly?

Second small boy—Yes, indeed—Papa caught one two years ago and it grows six inches every time he speaks of it.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B. A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.